Exhibit F

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,151	01/14/2004	Michael P. Casey	WMS-043	3165

30223 7590 07/09/2007

NIXON PEABODY LLP
161 N. CLARK STREET
48TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60601-3213

EXAMINER	
KIM, ANDREW	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3714	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/757,151	CASEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew Kim	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 January 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-48* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-22* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *22-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 January 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/14/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-21, drawn to a bonus game in which a player selected object is increased and the results are associated with an award, classified in class 463, subclass 16.

II. Claims 22-48, drawn to a bonus game in which a player selected tile is revealed to show different rewards, classified in class 463, subclass 18.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the subcombination has separate utility such as being used as a memory-type game.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Blankstein on June 11, 2007 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of a simultaneous multiple award feature, claims 22-48. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1-21 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 22, 23, 25, 30, 32-36, 42-45, and 48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bennett (US 6,015,346).

Claims 22,33, 43. Bennett discloses a method of conducting a wagering game on a gaming machine controlled by a controller in response to a wager, the method comprising:

displaying on a display device of the gaming machine, an assemblage of selectable tiles that conceal an associated plurality of icons, the plurality of icons including a plurality of game-theme

icons and a wild icon (Abstract, fig.2, col. 2:25) the game-theme icons have been interpreted as the cards/tiles that turn over and the associated award value ($10 or $50);

receiving successive selections of the tiles (col. 1:45-62);

selectively revealing a first group of related game-theme icons associated with the selected tiles (col. 1:45-62); A group of one tile and one associated award value.

selectively revealing a second group of related game-theme icons associated with the selected tiles, the second group different from the first group (col. 1:45-62); The second group interpreted as the second tile and the associated award value thereof.

selectively revealing the wild icon associated with the selected tiles after revealing the first group and the second group (col. 2:12-27 and col. 3:40-46); and

simultaneously awarding a first award and a second award (col. 1:45-62). Since a distinction between the first and second award has not been made, the examiner has interpreted the two awards to be the same award multiplied by two which is disclosed by Bennett (col. 3:40-45).

Claims 23, 34. Bennett discloses associating the wild icon with the first group to form a first match, the first match yielding the first award; and associating the wild icon with the second group to form a second match, the second match yielding the second award (col. 2:12-27).

Claims 25, 35. Bennett discloses wherein the first group of related game-theme icons comprises a first pair of like game-theme icons, and wherein the second group of related game-theme icons comprises a second pair of like game-theme icons (col. 1:45-62).

Claims 30, 36, 48. Bennett discloses wherein the gaming machine comprises a video slot machine,

and wherein displaying the assemblage of selectable tiles includes displaying a video generated assemblage of selectable tiles (fig. 1-3, abstract).

Claim 32. Bennett discloses wherein the first award comprises a first credit amount, and wherein the second award comprises a second credit amount (Bennett, col. 3:40-45).

Claim 42. Bennett discloses wherein the assemblage of selectable tiles is arranged as a matrix having multiple rows and columns (Bennett, col. 3:14).

Claim 44. Bennett discloses wherein the tiles associated with each award of the multiple award outcome are linked with a group of related icons and a wild icon (Bennett, col. 3).

Claim 45. Bennett discloses wherein the tiles associated with each award of the multiple award outcome are linked with a pair of like game-theme icons and a wild icon (Bennett, col. 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 24, 26-29, 31, 37-41, 46, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett (US 6,015,346) in view of Schneider et al. (US 6,089,976).

Claims 24. Bennett substantially discloses the invention as claimed but fails to explicitly teach displaying a legend adjacent to the assemblage of selectable tiles, the legend displaying a plurality of matches and respective awards, each of the plurality of matches including a plurality of related game-theme icons. Instead, Bennett teaches displaying randomly associating prizes with each displayed indicia (col. 3:60). In an analogous reference, Schneider teaches having a pay table to provide the player with the winnings (Schneider, col. 3:19) and credit meter 42 (Schneider, col. 4:62). Schneider is an analogous reference because Schneider discloses displaying a plurality of selectable tiles that are selectively revealed to the player. One of ordinary skill in the art would have seen the benefit of adding a legend or paytable to entice the player by showing the player how much the player may win with a single wager. The paytable also functions as an easy-to-understand table that enables the player to translate what he sees on the display to possible money in his account thereby enticing the player to play the game more increase casino profits. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a legend or paytable to entice the player to play the game and increase casino profits.

Claims 26 and 31, 37, 39. Bennett substantially discloses the invention as claimed but fails to explicitly teach displaying a base wagering game including a plurality of possible randomly-selected

outcomes, at least one of the possible outcomes being a bonus game triggering event causing the assemblage of selectable tiles to be displayed. Instead, Bennett teaches his game as a stand alone game. In an analogous reference, Schneider teaches displaying an assemblage of selectable tiles as a bonus game instead of a stand alone game (Schneider, Abstract). Schneider is an analogous reference because Schneider discloses displaying a plurality of selectable tiles. One of ordinary skill in the art would have seen the benefit of modifying Bennett to contain a two-tiered gaming system to provide creative interaction between a player and a game such that the player is being stimulated by active participation in the game while simultaneously anticipating an increased payout in terms of monetary value (Schneider, col. 1:48-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bennett with a two-tiered gaming system to provide increased player stimulation as desirably taught by Schneider.

Claims 27, 38. Bennett as modified by Schneider with the same line of reasoning of claims 26, 31, 37, and 39 discloses wherein the base wagering game includes a plurality of symbol-bearing reels that are rotated and stopped to place symbols on the reels in a reel symbol array, and wherein the bonus game triggering event includes a predetermined arrangement of selected symbols on the stopped reels (Schneider, col. 5).

Claims 28, 40, 46. Bennett as modified by Schneider substantially discloses the invention as claimed but fails to explicitly teach wherein the first award comprises a first number of free reel spins, and wherein the second award comprises a second number of free reel spins. Instead, Bennett seems to teach numerical monetary amounts. However, it is well known and obvious in the art at the time of the invention to provide free spins as awards. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one or

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to modify the monetary award in Bennett to the equivalent of free spins as the award to enhance player appeal and allow the player to have more chances to win a prize.

Claims 29, 41, 47. Bennett as modified by Schneider with the same line of reasoning of claims 26, 31, 37, and 39 discloses comprising multiplying a credit amount associated with a winning outcome of at least one of the first number of free reel spins by a first randomly generated number, and multiplying a credit amount associated with a winning outcome of at least one of the second number of free spins by a second randomly generated number (Bennett, col. 3, fig. 2 and 4).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Yoseloff et al. (US 6311976) – Video game with bonusing

Colin et al. (US 6346043) – Image matching game

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-1691. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on 571-272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AK 6/25/2007

/Scott Jones/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714

MPD
1/14/04

Form PTO-1449 (modified)	Atty. Docket No. WMS-043	Serial No. ~~Unassigned~~ 10/757,151
List of Patents and Publications for Applicant's INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT	Applicant Casey et al.	
Page 1 of 1	Filing Date: January 14, 2004	Group: Unassigned

U.S. Patent Documents

Exam. Init.	Ref. Des.	Document Number	Date	Name	Class	Sub Class	Filing Date If App.
/AK/	A01	6,015,346	01/18/2000	Bennett	463	20	07/27/1997
/AK/	A02	6,089,976	07/18/2000	Schneider et al.	463	16	10/14/1997
/AK/	A03	6,190,255 B1	02/20/2001	Thomas et al.	463	20	07/31/1998
/AK/	A04	6,346,043 B1	02/12/2002	Colin et al.	463	17	09/13/1999
/AK/	A05	6,347,996 B1	02/19/2002	Gilmore et al.	463	17	09/12/2000
/AK/	A06	6,589,114 B2	07/08/2003	Rose	463	20	07/25/2001

Foreign Patent Documents

Exam. Init.	Ref. Des.	Document Number	Date	Country	Class	Sub Class	Translation Yes/No
	B01						
	B02						

Other Art (Including Author, Title, Date Pertinent Pages, Etc.)

Exam. Init.	Ref. Des.	Citation
	C01	
	C02	
	C03	

EXAMINER: /Andrew Kim/	DATE CONSIDERED: 06/15/2007

EXAMINER: INITIAL IF REFERENCE CONSIDERED, WHETHER OR NOT CITATION IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH MPEP609; DRAW LINE THROUGH CITATION IF NOT IN CONFORMANCE AND NOT CONSIDERED. INCLUDE COPY OF THIS FORM WITH NEXT COMMUNICATION TO APPLICANT.

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 10/757,151	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination CASEY ET AL.	
	Examiner Andrew Kim	Art Unit 3714	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A	US-6,311,976	11-2001	Yoseloff et al.	273/138.2
*	B	US-6,346,043	02-2002	Colin et al.	463/17
	C	US-			
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.